



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/514,978	02/29/2000	Mary Ellen Zurko	C99020US	2130
7590	01/30/2004		EXAMINER	
DIEDERIKS & WHITELAW, PLC			DARROW, JUSTIN T	
12471 Dillingham Square				
# 301				
Woodbridge, VA 22192				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2132	
DATE MAILED: 01/30/2004				

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.
Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

	Application No. 09/514,978	Applicant(s) ZURKO ET AL.
	Examiner Justin T. Darrow	Art Unit 2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 21-41 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 38-41 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 21-37 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on N/A is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4. | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
|---|---|

Art Unit: 2132

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-41 have been presented for examination. Claims 1-20 have been canceled in a preliminary amendment filed 02/29/2000. Claims 21-41 have been examined.

Priority

2. Acknowledgment is made that the instant application is a division of Application No. 07/479,666, filed 02/13/1990, now U.S. Patent No. 6,507,909 B1.

3. Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 121 as follows:

An application in which the benefits of an earlier application are desired must contain a specific reference to the prior application(s) in the first sentence of the specification or in an application data sheet (37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) and (a)(5)). The specific reference to any prior nonprovisional application must include the relationship (i.e., continuation, divisional, or continuation-in-part) between the applications except when the reference is to a prior application of a CPA assigned the same application number.

Res Judicata

4. In the letter attached with the information disclosure statement, filed 09/12/2001, Paper No. 4, page 2, lines 3-14, the applicant, citing *Pfaff v. Wells Electronics*, 5 F.3d 514, 518 (Fed. Cir. 1993), states the Office may be estopped from rejecting claims 38-41 based on the combination of the references, UNIX Operating System and Dunford, "Filer, Version 2.20 User Documentation," because of the judgment reversing the rejection of claims 1, 4, and 5 of

Art Unit: 2132

Application No. 07/479,666 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on these references in *In re Zurko*, 59 U.S.P.Q.2d 1693 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

5. Res judicata does not apply when the claims at issue in the child application are different from those in the previously adjudicated parent application. See MPEP § 706.03(w); *In re Fried*, 136 USPQ 429, 431 (C.C.P.A. 1963). Additionally, in the situation of different claims in the divisional application, the grounds of rejection of the claims in this application may be based on the same statutory basis, such as 35 U.S.C. 103(a), and the combination of the same references, but supported by different reasoning than that used to reject claims in the previously litigated parent application. See *In re Hellbaum*, 152 USPQ 571, 572 (C.C.P.A. 1967). In *Pfaff*, res judicata was limited to the issue of claim construction of the same claims at issue in both infringement actions. See *Pfaff*, 28 USPQ2d 1119, 1121 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The instant application is distinguished from *Pfaff* in that the claims at issue are different from those in the parent case.

6. In the instant application, claims 38-41 are the same as claims 6-9, respectively, of Application No. 07/479,666. They are patently distinct from claims 1, 4, and 5 of Application No. 07/479,666 because they represent a subcombination useable together. See MPEP § 806.05(d) and Paper No. 17 of Application 07/479,666, mailed 07/21/1993.

Drawings

7. Formal drawings are required in this application because they are missing. The formal drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for formal drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

8. Claim 24 is objected to because of the following informality: delete "trust" in line 2 and replace with --trusted--. Appropriate correction is required.
9. Claim 35 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim, or amend the claim to place the claim in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim in independent form. Claim 35 recites the limitation, "transitioning from the untrusted mode to the untrusted mode," which does not result in a change in the method incorporated in the base claim. This objection can be overcome by deleting the first "untrusted" in line 2 and replacing with --trusted--.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the

reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

11. Claims 29-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Johri et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,918,653 A.

As per claim 29, Johri et al. describe a method of processing a trusted command comprising:

interpreting a trusted command in an untrusted mode (see column 27, lines 3-6; figure 13; pressing the Secure Attention Key to be interpreted in the untrusted mode; see column 22, lines 16-20; causing the line discipline driver to send a SIGSAK signal to all processes within the untrusted mode running on the terminal to terminate); and

executing the trusted command in a trusted mode (see column 22, lines 25-38; forking a new child process to create a trusted shell then creating a trusted path for the user's terminal and protecting the terminal from reading and writing by unauthorized programs).

As per claim 30, Johri et al. further mention:

communicating a representation of the trusted command in the trusted mode (see column 22, lines 40-46; changing the ut_type field for the terminal to TSH_PROCESS in the /etc/utmp file).

As per claim 31, Johri et al. then discuss:

verifying the trusted command in the trusted mode after the communicating (see column 22, lines 53-55; detecting the trusted shell by reading the corresponding /etc/utmp entry).

As per claim 32, Johri et al. moreover point out:

requesting confirmation of the trusted command in the trusted mode (see column 22, lines 53-55; when the user requests to exit the trusted shell).

As per claim 33, Johri et al. also specifies:

using the trusted command in the untrusted mode (see column 22, lines 16-20; sending the SIGSAK signal to all processes within the controlling terminal process group in the untrusted shell to terminate the user processes).

As per claim 34, Johri et al. next delineate:

transitioning from the untrusted mode to the trusted mode (see column 22, lines 23-38; if the trusted path is not created, creating the trusted path; see column 27, lines 3-8; figure 13; terminating the untrusted shell and creating in its place the trusted shell).

As per claim 35, Johri et al. alternatively discuss:

transitioning from the untrusted mode to the untrusted mode (see column 26, lines 2-12; figure 8, State S1; before login in the untrusted shell in State 1, pressing the Secure Attention Key immediately comes back to State 1).

Art Unit: 2132

As per claim 36, Johri et al. further elaborate that:

issuing a message to indicate a transition to the untrusted mode before the transitioning step (see column 22, lines 16-20; sending a SIGSAK signal to all processes within the untrusted mode running on the terminal to terminate).

As per claim 37, Johri et al. subsequently describe:

detecting if a command is a trusted command in an untrusted mode (see column 26, lines 9-23; figure 8, States S1, S2, and S3; carrying out the command of pressing the Secure Attention Key if the user has successfully logged in).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
13. Claims 21-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johri et al. U.S. Patent No. 4,918,653 A in view of Rivest et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,405,829 A.

As per claim 21, Johri et al. illustrates a computing environment to process a trusted command, comprising:

an untrusted environment to encrypt a trusted command to be compared with encrypted passwords on a list (see column 26, lines 2-7 and 15-17; figure 8, States 1 and 2; State 1 is before

Art Unit: 2132

login and State 2 is the state after login in an untrusted shell, but before the trusted shell; see column 26, lines 48-61; figure 11; the login program encrypts the password entered by the user as a command to login); and

a trusted environment to receive the trusted command from the untrusted environment (see column 27, lines 33-36; figure 14; typing the password command where the password command is in the trusted shell) and to communicate a representation of the trusted command (see column 27, lines 41-44; figure 14; having that command execute and then returning to the trusted shell).

Although Johri et al. disclose encrypting a trusted command (see column 26, lines 48-61; figure 11; the login program encrypts the password entered by the user as a command to login), they do not explicitly teach parsing a trusted command.

Rivest et al. describe encrypting a message by parsing (see column 4, lines 32-37; breaking the message into message block words before encoding).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the computer art at the time the invention was made to combine the computing environment of Johri et al. with the parsing of Rivest et al. to have a public key stored in an untrusted environment for encrypting a password to be compared with a list of encrypted passwords that cannot be decrypted by the public key (see column 26, lines 43-51).

As per claim 22, Johri et al. further point out:

that the trusted environment executes the trusted command (see column 27, lines 33-39; figure 14; the first transition in the trusted shell involves the execution of the password

Art Unit: 2132

command) if the trusted environment detects confirmation of the trusted command (see column 26, lines 11-25; figure 8; where the trusted shell is available only after a successful login with the correct password).

As per claim 23, Johri et al. also describe:

the representation of the trusted command is communicated through a trusted path (see column 27, lines 41-44; figure 14; returning the command to the trusted shell; see column 27, lines 21-28; figure 13; establishing the trusted path; see column 27; lines 9-12; figure 13; between the user and the trusted shell);

As per claim 24, Johri et al. additionally specify:

that the trusted path is between the user and the trust environment (see column 27, lines 9-12; figure 13; the trusted path between the user and the trusted shell).

As per claim 25, Johri et al. then mention:

a user interface to communicate with the untrusted environment (see column 26, lines 48-52; figure 11; a terminal for the user to login to the untrusted shell) and the trusted environment (see column 26, lines 3-7; figure 8; user is actually in the trusted shell).

As per claim 26, Johri et al. depict a method of processing a trusted command, comprising:

Art Unit: 2132

encrypting a trusted command to be compared with encrypted passwords on a list, in an untrusted mode of a system (see column 26, lines 2-7 and 15-17; figure 8, States 1 and 2; State 1 is before login and State 2 is the state after login in an untrusted shell, but before the trusted shell; see column 26, lines 48-61; figure 11; the login program encrypts the password entered by the user as a command to login);

establishing a trusted mode of the system (see column 26, lines 3-7; figure 8, State 3; the user going into the trusted shell); and

communicating a representation of the trusted command in the trusted mode (see column 27, lines 41-44; figure 14; having the password command execute and then returning to the trusted shell).

Although Johri et al. disclose encrypting a trusted command (see column 26, lines 48-61; figure 11; the login program encrypts the password entered by the user as a command to login), they do not explicitly teach parsing a trusted command.

Rivest et al. describe encrypting a message by parsing (see column 4, lines 32-37; breaking the message into message block words before encoding).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the computer art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Johri et al. with the parsing of Rivest et al. to have a public key stored in an untrusted environment for encrypting a password to be compared with a list of encrypted passwords that cannot be decrypted by the public key (see column 26, lines 43-51).

As per claim 27, Johri et al. further point out:

Art Unit: 2132

executing the trusted command in the trusted mode (see column 27, lines 33-39; figure 14; the first transition in the trusted shell involves the execution of the password command) if confirmation of the trusted command is detected (see column 26, lines 11-25; figure 8; where the trusted shell is available only after a successful login with the correct password).

As per claim 28, Johri et al. next discuss:

displaying a representation of the trusted command (see column 5, lines 22-26; figure 1; a display for characters sent to the display device; see column 27, lines 41-44; issuing the password command resulting in the changed password displayed to the user).

Allowable Subject Matter

14. Claims 38-41 are allowed.
15. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Claims 38-41 are drawn to method for executing a trusted command. The closest prior art, Johri et al. U.S. Patent No. 4,918,653 A in view of Rivest et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,405,829 A, disclose a similar method. Johri et al. describes encrypting a trusted command to be compared with encrypted passwords on a list, in an untrusted mode of a system (see column 26, lines 2-7 and 15-17; figure 8, States 1 and 2; State 1 is before login and State 2 is the state after login in an untrusted shell, but before the trusted shell; see column 26, lines 48-61; figure 11; the login program encrypts the password entered by the user as a command to login). Rivest et al. specify encrypting a message by parsing (see column 4, lines 32-37; breaking the message into message block words before encoding). However, they teach away from submitting the parsed command

to the trusted computing environment; and performing a security check on the parsed command and user identification data in the trusted computing environment. This composite recitation explicitly incorporated into independent claim 38 renders claims 38-41 allowable.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Dept. of Defense, "Dept. of Defense Trusted Computer System Evaluation Criteria," sets forth a standard of security features that satisfy trust requirements to prevent disclosure of data for sensitive applications

Telephone Inquiry Contacts

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Justin T. Darrow whose telephone number is (703) 305-3872 and whose electronic mail address is justin.darrow@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barrón, Jr., can be reached at (703) 305-1830.

The fax number for Formal or Official faxes to Technology Center 2100 is (703) 872-9306. In order for a formal paper transmitted by fax to be entered into the application file, the paper and/or fax cover sheet must be signed by a representative for the applicant. Faxed formal papers for application file entry, such as amendments adding claims, extensions of time, and statutory disclaimers for which fees must be charged before entry, must be transmitted with an authorization to charge a deposit account to cover such fees. It is also recommended that the cover sheet for the fax of a formal paper have printed "**OFFICIAL FAX**". Formal papers transmitted by fax usually require three business days for entry into the application file and consideration by the examiner. Formal or Official faxes including amendments after final rejection (37 CFR 1.116) should be submitted to (703) 872-9306 for expedited entry into the application file. It is further recommended that the cover sheet for the fax containing an amendment after final rejection have printed not only "**OFFICIAL FAX**" but also "**AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL**".

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

January 26, 2004

Justin T. Darrow
JUSTIN T. DARROW
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100